

University of Groningen

Brains in interaction

Schippers, Marleen Bernadette

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

2011

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Schippers, M. B. (2011). *Brains in interaction*. s.n.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Brains in Interaction

Marleen Bernadette Schippers



rijksuniversiteit
groningen

Brains in Interaction

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van het doctoraat in de
Medische Wetenschappen
aan de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
op gezag van de
Rector Magnificus, dr. E. Sterken,
in het openbaar te verdedigen op
woensdag 9 maart 2011
om 16:15 uur

door

Marleen Bernadette Schippers
geboren op 2 mei 1979
te Nijmegen

Promotor: Prof. dr. C. Keyzers

Beoordelingscommissie: Prof. dr. U. Hasson (Princeton University)
Prof. dr. V. Lamme (Universiteit van Amsterdam)
Prof. dr. R. Malach (Weizmann Institute of Science)

ISBN printed version: 978-90-367-4699-1

ISBN digital version: 978-90-367-4700-4

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Mirroring and simulation theory	1
1.2	Mentalizing	3
1.3	Mirroring, mentalizing, and communication	4
1.4	The charades experiment	5
1.5	Granger causality	7
1.6	Granger causality and the BOLD response	8
1.7	Outline of the thesis	9
	Bibliography	20
2	BROCA'S: LINKING PERCEPTION AND PRODUCTION	23
2.1	Introduction	23
2.2	Broca's anatomy	24
2.3	Lesion studies of language	25
2.3.1	Language production	25
2.3.2	Language comprehension	26
2.4	Lesion studies of actions	27
2.4.1	Action execution	27
2.4.2	Action perception	28
2.5	Functional studies on language	28
2.5.1	Language production	29
2.5.2	Language comprehension	29
2.6	Functional studies on actions	30
2.6.1	Action execution	30
2.6.2	Action perception	31
2.7	Mirroring	32
2.8	Broca's area: between language and action	33
	Bibliography	43
3	PLAYING CHARADES IN THE FMRI	45
3.1	Introduction	45
3.2	Materials and Methods	50
3.3	Results	55
3.3.1	Behavioural Results	55
3.3.2	Whole Brain fMRI Results	56

3.3.3	Regions of Interest fMRI Results	59
3.4	Discussion	63
3.5	Conclusions	67
	Bibliography	76
	Activation Tables	77
	Supplementary Information 1	80
	Supplementary Information 2	81
4	MAPPING INFORMATION FLOW BETWEEN BRAINS	83
4.1	Introduction	83
4.2	Materials and Methods	86
4.3	Results	89
4.3.1	BbGCM: gesturer to guesser	89
4.3.2	BbGCM: gesturer to passive observation	91
4.3.3	BbGCM: gesturer to a random guesser	91
4.3.4	GLM of instantaneous motion energy	92
4.4	Discussion	92
	Bibliography	103
	Supplementary Information 1	104
	Supplementary Information 2	111
	Supplementary Figures	114
5	EFFECT OF HRF VARIABILITY ON GRANGER CAUSALITY	123
5.1	Introduction	123
5.2	Methods	125
5.2.1	Generation of fMRI time series	126
5.2.2	Generation of hemodynamic response function	127
5.2.3	Granger Causality	127
5.2.4	Statistical analysis	128
5.2.5	Comparison simulation and experimental data	130
5.2.6	Likelihood of true direction given a detected direction	130
5.3	Results	131
5.3.1	No Granger causality present	131
5.3.2	Granger causality present	132
5.3.3	Comparison simulated and real data	137
5.3.4	Likelihood true direction	138
5.4	Discussion	139
5.5	Conclusions	142
	Bibliography	145
	Supplementary Information 1	146

Supplementary Information 2	147
Supplementary Information 3	148
Supplementary Information 4	152
Supplementary Information 5	153
6 MAPPING INFORMATION FLOW WITHIN A BRAIN	157
6.1 Introduction	157
6.2 Material and Methods	162
6.3 Results	165
6.3.1 Behavioral Results	165
6.3.2 G-causality during guessing	165
6.3.3 G-causality during passive observation	165
6.3.4 G-causality during guessing versus passive observation	169
6.4 Discussion	169
Bibliography	178
Supplementary Methods	179
Supplementary Figures	182
7 CONCLUDING REMARKS	185
7.1 Implications for the mirror system	185
7.2 Implications for mentalizing	186
7.3 Implications for Granger causality	188
7.4 General implications	188
Bibliography	194
.....	
ABBREVIATIONS	199
ENGLISH SUMMARY	201
NEDERLANDSE SAMENVATTING	219
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	239
PUBLICATION LIST	245

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	Areas constituting the putative Mirror Neuron System and the mentalizing system in the human brain.	3
Figure 2.1	Broca's area shown on the cortical surface of the brain	25
Figure 3.1	Results of whole brain analyses for Gesturing, Guessing, Passive Observation rendered on a mean anatomy	58
Figure 3.2	Results of whole brain analyses for Gesturing, Guessing, Passive Observation rendered on the medial wall of a mean anatomy	58
Figure 3.3	Results of the region-of-interest analyses for the pMNS areas	61
Figure 3.4	Results of the region-of-interest analyses for the ToM areas	62
Figure 3.5	Comparison between Gazzola et al. (2007) and the current study	81
Figure 4.1	Explanation between-brains Granger causality mapping (bbGCM)	87
Figure 4.2	bbGCM: Gesturer → Guesser	90
Figure 4.3	Overview control analyses bbGCM	93
Figure 4.4	bbGCM: Gesturer → Passive Observer	114
Figure 4.5	Comparison Gesturer → Guesser with Gesturer → Passive Observer	115
Figure 4.6	bbGCM: Gesturer → Random Guesser	116
Figure 4.7	Comparison Gesturer → Guesser with Gesturer → Random Guesser	117
Figure 4.8	Comparison: Gesturer → Guesser with Gesturer → Same word of Random Guesser	118
Figure 4.9	Motion Energy GLM during Guessing	119
Figure 4.10	bbGCM at different Granger causality orders	119
Figure 4.11	Charades Paradigm	120
Figure 5.1	A faster hemodynamic response function could lead to an inverted Granger causality result	124
Figure 5.2	Mean proportion of correct and inverted results per neuronal delay.	131
Figure 5.3	Proportion of correct, inverted and non-significant results per connection and per neuronal delay for a noise-level of 20% and Granger causality strength of 0.1	133
Figure 5.4	Proportion of correct, inverted and non-significant results per connection and per neuronal delay for a noise-level of 20% and Granger causality strength of 0.2	134
Figure 5.5	Proportion of correct, inverted and non-significant results per connection and per neuronal delay for a noise-level of 20% and Granger causality strength of 0.5	134

Figure 5.6	Proportion of correct, inverted and non-significant results per connection and per neuronal delay for a noise-level of 20% and Granger causality strength of 0.9	135
Figure 5.7	Hemodynamic response shapes for the four measured areas in 20 different subjects, sorted on amount of variability.	146
Figure 5.8	Spread of the parameters that were used to fit two gamma-functions on the measured hemodynamic responses	147
Figure 5.9	Proportion of correct, inverted and non-significant results per connection and per neuronal delay for a noise-level of 100% and Granger causality strength of 0.1	148
Figure 5.10	Proportion of correct, inverted and non-significant results per connection and per delay for a noise-level of 100% and Granger causality strength of 0.2	149
Figure 5.11	Proportion of correct, inverted and non-significant results per connection and per delay for a noise-level of 100% and Granger causality strength of 0.5	150
Figure 5.12	Proportion of correct, inverted and non-significant results per connection and per delay for a noise-level of 100% and Granger causality strength of 0.9	151
Figure 5.13	Results of Granger causality simulations in a connection with artificially created hemodynamic responses	152
Figure 5.14	Overview of the procedure used to generate the simulated data for the analysis presented in chapter 5.	153
Figure 6.1	Results second-level G-causality mapping during active guessing	166
Figure 6.2	Results second-level G-causality during passive observation . .	167
Figure 6.3	Comparison between G-causality during guessing and passive observation	168
Figure 6.4	Comparison between Granger causality results of the first and last period of guessing	182
Figure 6.5	Comparison between Granger causality results of two seed regions in the parietal lobe during guessing and passive observation	183
Figure 1	Areas constituting the putative Mirror Neuron System and the mentalizing system in the human brain.	203
Figure 2	Could a faster hemodynamic response lead to an inverted Granger causality result?	208
Figuur 3	Hersengebieden die deel uitmaken van het spiegelsysteem en het redeneersysteem.	222
Figuur 4	Kan een snellere hemodynamische respons leiden tot een schijnbare omgekeerde invloed bij een Granger causaliteitsanalyse?	227

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Action and object words used in the charades	51
Table 3.2	Activation Table for the main effect of guessing	77
Table 3.3	Activation Table for the main effect of passive observation . . .	77
Table 3.4	Activation Table for the main effect of gesturing	78
Table 3.5	Activation Table for the contrast guessing versus passive obser- vation	78
Table 3.6	Activation Table for the contrast guessing equals passive obser- vation	79
Table 4.1	Action and object words used in the charades	105
Table 5.1	Overview of difference in the delay parameter (δ_1) between source and target in seconds	129
Table 5.2	Statistical results for the negative delay group	136
Table 5.3	Statistical results for positive and no delay group	137
Table 5.4	Likelihood of true direction given a detected direction	138

